

M I N U T E S  
**ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT &  
RENEWABLE ENERGY STRATEGIES COMMITTEE  
June 20, 2012**

A meeting of the Economic Development & Renewable Energy Strategies Committee of the Council of the County of Kaua'i, State of Hawai'i, was called to order by Councilmember Dickie Chang, Chair, at the Historic County Building, Room 201, Līhu'e, Kaua'i, on Wednesday, June 20, 2012, at 11:06 a.m., after which the following members answered the call of the roll:

Honorable Tim Bynum  
Honorable Dickie Chang  
Honorable KipuKai Kuali'i  
Honorable Nadine K. Nakamura  
Honorable JoAnn A. Yukimura  
Honorable Jay Furfaro, Ex-officio  
Honorable Mel Rapozo, Ex-officio

The Committee proceeded on its agenda item as follows:

Bill No. 2436      A BILL FOR AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND CHAPTER 16 AND  
CHAPTER 17 OF THE KAUAI COUNTY CODE 1987, AS  
AMENDED, RELATING TO ELECTRIC VEHICLE  
CHARGING STATIONS [This item was deferred.]

Chair Chang:                      Thank you very much. I understand Mr. Sato, Mr. Sullivan, you have a presentation? Please come forward. Good morning to the both of you, you just need to introduce yourselves.

Council Chair Furfaro:      Mr. Chang, may I ask the members here, if you ask how many people in the audience want to testify on this item since we are breaking at 11:20 a.m., can I see a raise of hands? There are two people. We can always come back for dialogue on your presentation, but there may be some members who want to give testimony before we break for lunch.

Chair Chang:                      Thank you, good idea. Would any members of the community like to testify prior to their presentation? Mr. Mickens, you want to go ahead?

There being no objections, the rules were suspended.

GLENN MICKENS:      Thank you, Dickie, for the record Glenn Mickens. This is very short. I thought that Carl Imparato's testimony regarding Bill 2436 last week was right on target, and I agree with him 100%. I do not think that the taxpayer should subsidize the owners of electric vehicles by paying for the electricity they use at the charging stations, nor for the upkeep of the chargers. I applaud those who buy these electric vehicles to help get us off of fossil fuel, but I believe it is still their responsibility to pay for the electricity they use and not put the burden on those who drive gasoline operated vehicles. I completely support this bill. I think it is a well written bill, except the part that temporarily waives the user fee of \$1.81 per hour for the charging. That is the only thing I did not like about it. Thank you, Dickie.

Chair Chang:                      Thank you, Mr. Mickens. Any questions for Mr. Mickens? If not, Mr. Imparato, did you want to?

CARL IMPARATO: Aloha, Councilmembers. My name is Carl Imparato, and I would just like to offer a few follow-up points after my testimony of last week. To begin with, in the example that I presented, the estimate of \$1600 and change for free fuel from the County to an electric vehicle owner was based on the residential rate for electricity and because the County's rate is somewhat lower, that estimate was off by about 15%. So the amount of free electricity from the County in that example would be closer to \$1350. But it does not matter whether the amount of free electricity from the County is \$1,000 or \$1, I guess I do not believe that the County should be giving anyone free electricity. First of all, giving away free electricity to electric vehicle owners accomplishes nothing. If someone does not already own an electric car, they are not going to go out and buy one because of the six-month subsidy on a \$36,000 vehicle. And secondly, if they already own the car, then it is simply a gift of taxpayer money to the person or the company that bought the car. Secondly again, why should the County give away money to someone who owns an electric vehicle instead of assisting someone to purchase a fuel efficient 40-mile per gallon conventional vehicle rather than a 15-mile per gallon vehicle? Where does this end?

And that brings me to my biggest concern, which is that these subsidies in this bill are the camel's nose under the tent. They would establish a precedent for other subsidies, including those proposed in the 2010 Kaua'i Energy Sustainability Plan. That document proposed that the County tax Kaua'i residents more than \$62 million over the next 17-20 years. Among other things, that plan proposed \$35 million in subsidies to owners of hybrid and electric vehicles, \$2 million in subsidies to hourly vehicle rental programs for tourists, and \$3 million in subsidies to property owners who install conservation measures. So I feel that the free electricity in Bill 2436 is really the County's first step down the slippery slope of subsidizing John's electric car or Jane's electric solar hot water heater or Jack's roof insulation or Joan's rental car using taxpayer money. So I ask the County to not set the precedent of finding a new way to spend taxpayer money. I ask the Council instead to stand for the principle that the County will not tax some residents in order to subsidize the electricity consumption preferences for other residents' homes or vehicles.

In conclusion, the County is proposing really to move into a new business, to move into the business of selling fuel to electric vehicle owners. It is questionable to me why the County should expand into that area, why it should get into that business, but assuming that it has to do that, maybe there are State mandates to do that, to me the real problem then is that the County should not run that business at a loss. It should not run that business by giving electricity away for free. That goes too far. So I ask once more that you amend Bill 2436 to require that the fee for this service will take effect on Day 1 and that the fee will fully recover all of the County's costs. Thank you for your time.

Chair Chang: Excuse me, hold on Mr. Imparato. Any questions for Mr. Imparato? Did you just write notes here and there, is that something you want to work on that you can send over to us that written testimony?

Mr. Imparato: I can.

Chair Chang: Thank you very much. If there are no questions, thank you very much, Mr. Imparato.

There being no objections, the meeting was called back to order, and proceeded as follows:

Chair Chang: Mr. Chair, if I can ask you for your help, we have but five or six minutes before we recess, and based on the presentation, I would rather not go...

Council Chair Furfaro: You would rather not break it up.

Chair Chang: Yes, so we can have a little...

Council Chair Furfaro: Is there anyone else that wants to testify on the bill before we ask the Energy Sustainability Group to come back at 12:30 p.m., is that what you are suggesting?

Chair Chang: I would like to do that because we probably will not even get a quarter of the way through within the next six or seven minutes. So I would rather keep continuity, so we are...it is fresh.

Council Chair Furfaro: That is fine with me.

Chair Chang: If that is all right with the Members, is that all right with the Members? I would like to recess this Committee.

There being no objections, the meeting was recessed at 11:13 a.m.

The meeting was called back to order at 12:36 p.m., and proceeded as follows:

There being no objections, the rules were suspended.

Chair Chang: Thank you, Mr. Sato, thank you, Mr. Sullivan. The rules are suspended. You have a presentation, sir?

GLENN SATO, Sustainability Manager: Yes, we do.

Chair Chang: I think you did state your name for the record, but can we do that for the record?

Mr. Sato: Glenn Sato, Sustainability Manager.

BEN SULLIVAN, Energy Coordinator: Ben Sullivan, Energy Coordinator.

Chair Chang: Thank you, gentlemen.

Mr. Sato: I will try to move quickly on this PowerPoint. If you have any questions, we can always go back to a slide. Pretty much if you recall the mandate to put up these electric vehicle chargers came from State law. There is an HRS statute that says "for every public facility with 100 or more marked public parking stalls, you need at least one designated for electric car parking and each of those facilities needs a charger." So what we are looking at is our electric vehicle program. We are looking at a rapid market transformation that is underway. As we speak, vehicle improvements are coming hot and heavy. We are having faster chargers coming on, longer range batteries being developed, cheaper electric cars also coming on the market. The program is good in our eyes because it reduces oil dependence. Even with KIUC's 90% oil dependence, EVs use a lot less oil per mile and it is just better for the environment. The economics are really great. As Ben will attest to, he is one of our major drivers of the electric car, and he has basically

equated that the cost per mile is equal to a Prius. There is also a possibility of if we have more EVs on island that we would be able to look at time of use rates, so cheaper rates during the night when these cars are charging.

On slide 3, our proposed fee formula is very simple. It is for this pilot program. We looked at two months' worth of charging data for our Leaf, and it showed that we were consuming 3.5 kilowatts per hour of charging, and we used Schedule G Effective Rate of roughly 0.471 cents per kilowatt hour, and there is a charger service fee of 10%, so it is a very simple formula. If you look at it, it comes out to rounded \$1.81 per hour. One of the questions asked was why not an exact charge, and according to Motor Vehicle, at the end of 2011, we had 20 registered electric cars on Kaua'i, and those cars are the ones that request the special license plates. If an electric car comes on island and they do not want the special plates, I was told that they cannot track that for some reason. They do not track by makes or models of cars also. So we are looking at roughly 20 to 24 cars. Some of the past testimony has said 24, but if those are DBEDT numbers, those probably count the five County cars, so roughly 19 to 20 non-County cars. Most vehicles currently on the island charge at a relatively consistent rate, the current models. So we are looking at 3.3 to 3.5 kilowatts per hour of charging. So in our calculation if you go back and look at this calculation, we use the conservative 3.5 figure.

Our charger contractor is Aerovironment. Their system does not yet accommodate billing by units of energy. We were told that right now they can only bill according to time of use. So that is why we are coming up with this proposed charging fee per hour of vehicle charging. Administrative costs for more sophisticated billing may be prohibitive initially. That is what we are looking at and we do not want to over burden that figure. In the future, we might be able to accommodate exact amounts of energy used, administrative costs. When that happens, we would come back in for a modification of the rate.

One of the other questions asked was why not pass on fixed costs. I just wanted to remind Council that the chargers were purchased through an ARRA grant so we received \$279,000 to pay for five Leafs, five public chargers, and what was left out was it also included five County chargers. So through this grant we got five electric cars and ten chargers. This program also, through Aerovironment, it offers a program warranty for three years parts and on-site labor. So for the first three years, we are not going to see any maintenance costs associated with this. System variable costs can be captured approximately through hourly charges, that is what we are trying to do now. Fixed costs can be integrated after the grant period to cover any operating expenses if applicable.

I am going to turn it over to Ben right now to go over slide 6, which is why we are asking for a waiver.

Mr. Sullivan: Thank you, Glenn. There is just some really simple reasons up here on the board for why a waiver. Providing an incentive for early adopters is certainly a part of it, not the entire thing. Demonstrating support from the County to transition, the assessment here is the decision that you folks all have to reflect on, obviously, is whether you think this is a benefit to the community, and we are advocating that it is to see a transition, and this is one of the ways to help bring that about and to get the buzz going and to get people participating and thinking about these issues. The third bullet here "allow the County time to accrue experience before we actually have cash transactions," we have a small user pool. There is going to be very small transactions taking place of \$3 or \$4 here or there. It would be very cumbersome if we had problems with several dozens of those transactions and we had to chase them through a County process in order to remedy

them, and so we are hoping to debug the system in part during this period of the waiver. And then obviously there is plenty of other places where government chooses to provide incentive, and that obviously falls into your court to make that determination. To determine what the possible costs of a six-month waiver were, there is a lot of assumptions involved. Glenn already talked about how many vehicles were on island at the beginning of the year, there may be more now. We do not have an exact count, but I do believe the DBEDT numbers recently, which was, I think, maybe the 2<sup>nd</sup> quarter of this year, came out to 24. You then have to ask how often are people going to use the County chargers versus charging at home, and some of the impacts to that thinking is that it takes 6 to 8 hours to fully charge one of these vehicles. So if somebody is going to really lean heavily on this notion of free electricity, they are going to give up a lot of their own time to do so. It also depends on the state of charge of the vehicle when it is plugged in. So it is fairly difficult to determine exactly how much usage we might see, but we went ahead and threw out some example scenarios just to give you an order of magnitude. So this next slide here, slide no. 8, is talking about the cost associated with 10 hours of charging per week on 5 chargers, 25 hours, and then you can see on this last one, what we did is instead of just looking at it as usage on the chargers, we did a hypothetical on the other 20 vehicles, as the number stands now, assuming that they ran at 12,000 miles a year and that they relied on the County 100% for their charging, that would equate to 58 hours times 5 chargers, so you are seeing a total cost of \$477 a week. We think this is extremely unlikely, but we wanted to try to represent, in some way or another, the worst case. And this is just additional math on that last scenario, so I am not going to spend a lot of time on that unless you want to review that and have questions.

This, I think, goes back to Glenn.

Mr. Sato: These are just finishing slides just to show you. This is basically an example of a really simple installation charger. This is the one at the Water Department. The electrical room and the power panel is directly in the back of that wall. So it is basically connecting to the panel, punching through the wall, and mounting it on the wall also. The parking space is right in the front.

This is the most difficult one we had to deal with. It is at the Kaua'i Museum corner. We actually had to drop new service from that utility pole right there. You can see the conduit had to come under the sidewalk, and they had to trench all over the place to lay their conduit, leading to a meter stand, where we had to activate a new meter, and this current location has five chargers, and that is pretty much our presentation.

There being no objections, the meeting was called back to order, and proceeded as follows:

Chair Chang: Thank you Glenn and Ben. Councilmember Rapozo has a question for you, but before we get to that, we did take a break right before lunch, so Committee Members, can I please get a motion to approve this item?

Councilmember Bynum moved for approval of Bill No. 2436, seconded by Councilmember Yukimura.

There being no objections, the rules were suspended.

Chair Chang: Councilmember Rapozo.

Mr. Rapozo: Thank you. Glenn, that installation by the Museum, that is all covered under the grant? All of that installation costs?

Mr. Sato: Yes.

Mr. Rapozo: Completely by the grant?

Mr. Sato: What happened was the \$279,000...we actually started off looking at the facilities that fell under the State law: Vidinha Stadium, Wailua Golf Course, Lydgate Beach Park. Wailua Golf Course was ineligible to use ARRA funds. Lydgate Park, we could not find a close power supply plus security was a really major concern. Vidinha Stadium was an intermittent use facility, so we decided not to do it. The State law allowed us to kind of replace, move a charger from one facility to a more appropriate facility, and that is basically why we ended up at the Historic County Building, Civic Center Pi'ikoi Building. Even in doing so, we fell short on some of the installation costs, so we actually had to take moneys from my funding, the State grant that I received that fiscal year, and I think we added about \$75,000.

Mr. Rapozo: All right, and I guess my point is that there is an operational cost to this project.

Mr. Sato: There is an operational cost based on the installation of the chargers.

Mr. Rapozo: Right, that is why I am saying going forward the maintenance is under warranty for three years.

Mr. Sato: Yes.

Mr. Rapozo: But there is a cost attributed to...

Mr. Sato: And there will be for future chargers if the County decides to do so.

Mr. Rapozo: Exactly, if we decide to expand the program, the three-year warranty is really just for the ones that we have, but those wear out. Those have to be replaced eventually. So there is a cost.

Mr. Sato: Yes, in discussing the chargers too, this pilot will determine charger life. We have the chargers, we use stainless steel as much as possible, underground conduits, the fixtures themselves are NEMA 4. So we are taking all of that into account, but we just do not know in terms of the maintenance costs moving forward, how long these chargers will last.

Mr. Rapozo: Thank you.

Chair Chang: Thank you, Councilmember Rapozo. Any other Councilmembers? Councilmember Kualii.

Mr. Kualii: Thank you, Chair, just a couple quick questions. So the \$279,000 ARRA grant, we were able to get that grant without any County matching funds.

Mr. Sato: No, it did not have any matching fund requirement, but as I mentioned to Councilmember Rapozo, in the course of trying to put these chargers in, we fell short because of the location of some of these chargers and the difficulty in connecting to the power source.

Mr. Kualii: So you went for State funds?

Mr. Sato: Well, I had a State grant that had discretionary categories, so I just took some of those funds and applied it to this program.

Mr. Kualii: And then the other thing was...was it a part of securing the \$279,000 ARRA grant, was it one of the deliverables of that grant to provide an incentive for early adopters and stimulate thinking around EVs in the community or to give that free to the citizens?

Mr. Sato: No, it was not a part of that. The push to provide a waiver is basically the Mayor wanted to pretty much try to kick-start the movement, support the movement. So he suggested that we put in for a temporary waiver, so we are looking for a waiver until the end of the year.

Mr. Kualii: Earlier one of the citizens testified that we are using one taxpayer's dollars to give free, something of value, fuel, if you will, to another taxpayer, and while it is looking clearer that it is not directly County General Funds or Transportation Funds, if the ARRA Funds are still federal funds, and so it is still taxpayers' money in a different sense. How much of the \$279,000 is represented in the amount that is being given away in free fuel to citizens?

Mr. Sato: The \$279,000 was used for the five cars and the ten chargers. So in terms of providing any waiver, it is not part of this grant.

Mr. Kualii: But the grant moneys did pay for the 5 public chargers to be put in.

Mr. Sato: Yes.

Mr. Kualii: I guess the sun is giving us the power.

Mr. Sato: So if you are looking at the five public chargers and if the discussion is fixed costs, the grant paid for those fixed costs, and the grant will pay for any maintenance for three years.

Mr. Kualii: Okay, thank you.

Chair Chang: Thank you, Councilmember Kualii. Council Chair Furfaro.

Council Chair Furfaro: She had a question and I am not a member of your Committee. Gentlemen, as we go forward here, how do we accommodate some of the...the grant we got for \$279,000, did the Mayor's budget process, did it isolate any of those funds so that we would recover the actual charges from KIUC? Is that part of any of that earmarked money in the budget? We have to think of it as revenue centers and cost centers. This has the potential to be a revenue center with a 10% service charge, but we have to also realize with the 10% service charge, when people use their credit card, we are probably going to be seeing a service fee of about

3.5% of that going to the bank because I do not know our specific arrangement with credit card collection with whatever financial institution it is. I would suggest, so we have the potential to make a little bit of money through this charge.

Mr. Sato: Just to clarify, the transaction is going through Aerovironment. It is not going through the County system.

Council Chair Furfaro: Okay, then you are back to my question. We are going to give them 10%. Are they paying the bank for the service card? Who is paying the collector? I get a First Hawaiian Bank credit card.

Mr. Sato: Right.

Council Chair Furfaro: I use the credit allocation to run my charge. Aerovironment is going to charge us 10% of that and are they paying the service fee to the bank?

Mr. Sato: The customer is paying the 10% service fee. When we used our charger...

Council Chair Furfaro: I understand that. Let me say that again, I will pay that 10%, but as the revenue intake people, we will have a charge from the bank for servicing that account. Does the 10%...is it inclusive or is it in addition to we collect the money on that? And in what account is that credit charge reconciled and when do we get the net difference?

Mr. Sato: Aerovironment will collect the fee...

Council Chair Furfaro: Okay, let me put it the other way. Is Aerovironment getting the bill from KIUC?

Mr. Sato: No, the County gets the bill from KIUC.

Council Chair Furfaro: There, so there is the first part. We get the bill from KIUC. They are doing the collection, right?

Mr. Sato: Right.

Council Chair Furfaro: Now we have to pay the KIUC bill.

Mr. Sato: Yes.

Council Chair Furfaro: Are they going to give it to us net of the service charge?

Mr. Sato: Yes.

Council Chair Furfaro: They will. What is that service charge?

Mr. Sato: 10% of the transaction.

Council Chair Furfaro: That is steep because if we did it with the bank ourselves with our own credit, it is 3.5% max. So there is that situation.

Mr. Sullivan: Council Chair, if I may.



Council Chair Furfaro: Sure, go right ahead.

Mr. Sullivan: I apologize. I think that there is a misunderstanding as to the nature of the service charges. I think you are speaking of a bank charge for the use of a credit card.

Council Chair Furfaro: Yes.

Mr. Sullivan: And we are speaking of a service charge for the infrastructure. So I believe, and we have to verify this, but I do believe that the service charges for the credit card are on the side of Aerovironment. So they are going to take 10% out of the total transaction and pass the rest of the money to the County to offset the electricity costs.

Council Chair Furfaro: And I would like to verify that is what is happening.

Mr. Sullivan: Certainly.

Council Chair Furfaro: I want somebody to look at that net collection fee and tell me the 10% is inclusive of what, and then I also, with that question, if you give your credit card, the actual charge is going into what account? It is not going directly into a County account. It is going into the Aerovironment account. They will reconcile the amount and then pay us 90% of what is collected so that we can pay KIUC?

Mr. Sullivan: Correct.

Mr. Sato: Yes.

Council Chair Furfaro: Okay, I would like to see that defined.

Mr. Sullivan: That is very reasonable, thank you.

Council Chair Furfaro: I think it is just good business to make sure we understand.

Now with this future sophisticated billing system, I do not quite understand. Eventually we are going to charge the card for kilowatt hour plus 10%, but we are not able to do that the first round out here?

Mr. Sullivan: That is correct.

Council Chair Furfaro: Okay, and so why did we not negotiate that upfront?

Mr. Sullivan: I think...my understanding, which is all I can offer, is that these issues are being figured out by a lot of entities across the country, and the nature of it is that this is a new system. There is not even surety as to who would own on a broader sense. Obviously for our community it does not necessarily make sense for 15 different private enterprises to have some affiliation with an account that they have to administer. But initially, it is not understood who is going to really take charge of the whole.

Council Chair Furfaro: You have answered my question, which has left the questions open.

Mr. Sullivan: Right.

Council Chair Furfaro: Okay, and I am just saying from a business standpoint for me, I want to make sure you folks are on it for getting those things cleared up because it could end up being a pretty challenging reconciliation of these five meters coming, I see you agreeing with me, Ben, but there are a lot of parts in there that we really need to nail down. Your intent is to do this three, maybe six months, right?

Mr. Sullivan: The proposal for the fee waiver is until the beginning of next year, six months.

Council Chair Furfaro: Six months, okay. So in that six months, you think you would be able to pin down some of these questions a little bit more, get them a little more refined?

Mr. Sullivan: That is the hope for sure, so yes.

Council Chair Furfaro: Okay, okay, that is the hope. Is that what you said? Or that is for sure?

Mr. Sullivan: I cannot say for sure that we will have all your questions answered in six months. This is a pilot and so we are learning from doing, and if those questions are not answered to your satisfaction in six months, obviously, you can make a determination as to how to proceed with our next proposal. But we are going to do our best to learn from this process and to investigate the issues you have raised, as well as others.

Council Chair Furfaro: Okay and I am not here or near on that. I just want to make sure you see my point of some real refined review, and by gosh, let us make sure we leave ourselves an audit trail that the revenue collected can be reconciled with the charges we get from KIUC. That is all I am saying. And you can do that in six months. You are hoping to.

Mr. Sullivan: Again, I do not know that we can. This is new, so we have a whole new system that we have to figure out and to just say today, yes, we are going to promise to do it in six months I think would not be totally honest. We need to...

Council Chair Furfaro: Okay, do not be dishonest with me.

Mr. Sullivan: Right.

Council Chair Furfaro: Just tell me this, we will put it as a goal.

Mr. Sullivan: That is definitely a goal.

Council Chair Furfaro: Okay, so you can sign off on that. We can put it as a goal.

Mr. Sullivan: Yes.

Council Chair Furfaro: Within that six months.

Mr. Sullivan: Yes.

Council Chair Furfaro: Because I think there are some real moving parts here we have to grab, and I think you are concurring with me. Make sure the County Attorney's Office is involved to review the understanding between us, Aerovironment, and KIUC.

Mr. Sato: Council Chair, I think the main intent is for the electricity that we provide through the chargers, we want to be reimbursed the actual cost so we do not lose anything.

Council Chair Furfaro: And I am saying I want us to be reimbursed, but I also think it is not unreasonable for us to have a 3.5% charge in there that covers our administration of this program. I mean there is a lot of accounting parts over there that needs to be reconciled, and I do not think that is unreasonable given the convenience and the administration that needs to be. But I have made my points and I look forward to this happening. I just want to make sure we leave an audit trail and we can reconcile it. I think that is fair. Thank you, Committee Chairman.

Chair Chang: Council Chairman, thank you very much. Vice Chair, you had a question?

Ms. Yukimura: Yes, I do. Thank you. You have on slide 2, you say even with KIUC being 90% dependent on oil that EVs use a lot less oil per mile. What is the per mile use of oil by an EV?

Mr. Sullivan: We did not get into an engineering analysis on a BTU basis, but what we did is we said, well the cost per mile for a Prius, which is primarily just from a gas standpoint, you are buying gasoline from a station and I think there is consensus that the vast majority of that is the commodity you are paying for as opposed to the service versus where when you buy electricity from KIUC, which you are getting half of their cost is fuel and then the rest of their cost is infrastructure and employment and debt service and all those other things. So there is substantially less money going to pay for fuel as a function of buying it via electricity, and the reality is just that their plants are much more efficient at turning energy into motion. So they are burning oil at a much more efficient rate than a car...than an internal combustion engine can do, and that is well understood. But we could, if you would like additional information from...

Ms. Yukimura: I think it would really promote EVs to know that information. At least for me to know that if you drive an EV car even though all the electricity is generated from oil that it takes so much oil...I just want to see kind of an orange-to-orange or apples-to-apples comparison because that is what has gone through my mind when I think about purchasing an electrical vehicle. I have said electric vehicles work only if they actually are supplied electricity from renewable sources. That was the first level of my thinking. But if you go beyond that, I can see the possibility that an electric vehicle, even though it is oil-based electricity, might still be saving oil.

Mr. Sullivan: Correct.

Ms. Yukimura: And that is kind of what I wanted to understand the measurements of. And then so that I am clear, the bill that we are looking at is basically going to be regulating the fees for the stalls that are shown in Exhibits A and B. Is that correct? Which are the ones right in this vicinity. Or are there other stalls that...

Mr. Sato: The public chargers are located one at the Pi'ikoi Building, there are two at the corner by the Kaua'i Museum, and there are two right outside the Historic County Building.

Ms. Yukimura: Okay, and those are on the maps, right?

Mr. Sato: Yes.

Ms. Yukimura: So that if another charger is installed anywhere else that is a public charger, we would amend this?

Mr. Sato: No. I believe the ordinance is written that it would cover any additional chargers that we install, but hopefully by that time we will have...

Ms. Yukimura: More data.

Mr. Sato: Yes, more data, and we will have a fee that is more refined.

Ms. Yukimura: Okay, are you able to point out the wording that is more inclusive? If not, excuse me...okay. Scott is pointing out in the bill Section 2 (d), the underlined section. So these are amendments to our existing parking...

Mr. Sato: County Code, right.

Ms. Yukimura: Our existing code provisions regarding parking. And what was the HRS provision that you mentioned? You said that it requires the counties to...

Mr. Sato: It is a mandate. It basically mandates not only the County, but any facility that provides marked public parking of 100 stalls or more to have one stall designated for electric vehicles and each one of those facilities needs to have a charger. It was amended this past session. Language said that the stalls had to be near the entrance, but I guess in hindsight and in their wisdom, the legislature modified it to just say that it had to be located somewhere on the site.

Ms. Yukimura: Among the 100, right?

Mr. Sato: Right.

Ms. Yukimura: That is one out of a hundred has to be...

Mr. Sato: I think a lot of the testimony that came about was there is a definite conflict when you say it has to be close to the entrance with the existing stalls that are for handicapped parking. And it is not a really easy thing to do to find the power source close to the entrance, and that was one of the main problems we had because it just escalates the installation cost tremendously.

Ms. Yukimura: Section 2 of the bill amends Section 16-10.6 regarding County Building and Civic Center off-street parking and enforcement. So it is sort of specific to this area?

Mr. Sato: All our public chargers are...

Ms. Yukimura: In this area.

Mr. Sato: Right.

Ms. Yukimura: But as for reference to other because you are saying that the County or HRS or the State law requires that not just the County but any entity that is providing marked public parking, so that could be a new hotel, right, that has to abide by certain parking requirements.

Mr. Sato: New hotel...

Ms. Yukimura: A business.

Mr. Sato: ...State buildings, shopping centers.

Ms. Yukimura: Even the Veterans' Building or a business, a large shopping center is like a large commercial establishment, and they have to provide so much parking, and this is for new construction or it is for anywhere that you have existing public parking?

Mr. Sato: I believe it is for any facility with existing public parking, and any new facility that would be coming up would have to also comply if they have more than 100 marked parking stalls. So I know that the Hyatt has installed chargers, the Marriott, the Princeville, Kukui Grove.

Ms. Yukimura: Okay, then who...they set their own charging fees?

Mr. Sato: Yes, it is up to them.

Mr. Sullivan: If I may, Councilwoman. This is what we were referring to before. There is a desire to...or at least coming down from the federal government, there is a desire to see electric vehicles be adopted, and so these moneys were made available. But it is clear to us in looking at this that the final system is not in place. It really does not make a lot of sense in our view to have all these different entities administering their own charging, but it is just a simple matter of they needed to get off the ground so these problems could be put in front of people, otherwise we would never get there. So there are challenges to the way it is set up now. If I had to venture a guess, I would imagine that you would see a consolidation as to how those are managed, and it may end up being where there are separate meters for charging stations so that you can go direct between KIUC and a charge provider in the public and there is not all these different third parties, which is what you have now, and that is just because all these charging stations are being set up on someone's existing meter, really for expediency, right? It would be very cost prohibitive for Aerovironment to put in a new meter for every station, in which case they would never get off the ground.

Ms. Yukimura: Okay, so when you think about a hotel that has to provide so many parking stalls under our Code, but they are responsible for maintaining it, they are responsible for maintaining the parking, and for liability, and everything, it is basically their property, but they just have to provide so much parking because...when they get a building permit, right, to make sure that there is sufficient parking.

Now there is this additional State law that says for every so much of public parking, you have to install an electric charger, one for every hundred. And basically we are just setting the fees for parking that we are responsible for.

Mr. Sato: This is only for County.

Ms. Yukimura: Right, right, and if we were to charge parking for...I mean meters for regular parking, we would have to have an ordinance saying that. But electric chargers, we are moving ahead with that because that is where moneys are involved right now.

Mr. Sato: Yes, the County does not charge for parking; we do not have meters. But to give you an example, at the State Capitol Building, they have meters. So the State has offered...it is probably for a short period like a waiver period, but you can park an electric car for free, you do not have to feed the parking meter.

Ms. Yukimura: Right.

Mr. Sato: And they also have the stall with the charger. You can charge for free.

Ms. Yukimura: Right, yes.

Mr. Rapozo: It is not free at the State.

Mr. Sato: The State Capitol?

Mr. Rapozo: It is \$2 an hour.

Mr. Sato: The parking, you mean?

Mr. Rapozo: No, the electric...I know because I rented (inaudible). It is \$2 an hour.

Mr. Sato: Okay, they must have passed their waiver because initially they did have a short free kind of thing.

Ms. Yukimura: When I rented a Leaf because they wanted to give me this huge car and I said no, so they said okay, take an electric. They told me, but they may have been mistaken already, that there was free electric charging at the State Capitol. Okay, thank you. I think I understand the framework of this bill that is before us and I understand that it is experimental, but it is important that we start, that we establish some means of charging money for charging electricity. Thank you.

Chair Chang: Thank you, Vice Chair. Councilmember Bynum.

Mr. Bynum: A lot of the questions I got answers. So we put our five right around here at the Civic Center. Do we not have more than 100 stalls at the Convention Center? Would we not be required to put one there?

Mr. Sato: That was another facility that yes, it was on the original list, but it is an intermittent use facility in terms of daytime use.

Mr. Bynum: But in terms of the law, Glenn, you said more than 100 stalls.

Mr. Sato: Yes, it falls under that law, but we pretty much exercised our option to find another location that would take its place. The same thing with Lydgate Beach Park and Wailua Golf Course, Vidinha Stadium, and then the Convention Hall. The Convention Hall, the problem there was the location of the power, the source, the electrical room, and where we could designate as the charger station.

Mr. Bynum: Okay, so under the law all of those facilities require a charger, but we can put them all here? It just determines the amount we have to do? Because when this law first came here and you guys presented, we talked about what County facilities have more than 100 stalls, right. So what I am hearing you say is okay, they have 100 stalls, but we can meet the requirement of the law and put the meter over here.

Mr. Sato: Right.

Mr. Bynum: Okay, so it does not say each facility must. It is saying...

Mr. Sullivan: My recollection, if I may, Councilmember Bynum, is that the initial law came out and then it was realized after the law came out that intermittent facilities did not make a lot of sense for chargers because people are not going to be sitting there for eight hours to charge their vehicles.

Mr. Bynum: Right, right.

Mr. Sullivan: And so I believe that the law was amended, but we can get back to you to affirm that, and that we have...it is our understanding that we have met our obligation as far as the requirement under the State.

Mr. Bynum: I am just curious. I am really in support of this. I have kind of been an early adopter in my lifetime and I would like to get an electric car if I could afford one. With a 100-mile range, I could probably come to and from work, but having the charger in Līhu'e would give me other options that I would not have. You folks kind of see a world where we are going to have a lot of electric cars on Kaua'i, right, and Kaua'i makes a lot of sense given that we do not have...we have basically one major thoroughfare. You have addressed already kind of okay, start up; all of these questions you are on it, and this is a question: Should not the County be providing leadership to bring these various entities together to create a norm for Kaua'i?

Mr. Sullivan: That is a great question, and yes, that is something that we have been discussing and we have been looking at doing. We would like to get KIUC in the room to do that, and we have actually made several presentations to KIUC on the matter. There are others that have expressed an interest, so absolutely we should be and we intend to be. We have not gotten to it yet.

Mr. Bynum: I just would encourage that. We can bring the folks together and my other questions are answered, and I understand pilots. If this was a three- or four-year waiver you were asking for, I would have second thoughts. But we probably will not have 40 uses between now and when this waiver ends, my guess is. So thank you.

Chair Chang: Thank you, Councilmember Bynum.  
Councilmember Nakamura, you had a question?

Ms. Nakamura: Hi, thank you for the presentation, for writing the grant, and for getting the grant and implementing it. That is a huge accomplishment and sets the stage for setting up the system on this island. While we were talking, Councilmember Rapozo showed me some information showing different sites in Honolulu and what they charge at the charging station, which varied from \$2 at the State Capitol to \$3 at some of the hotels per hour. I think I would agree with Council Chair Furfaro that we need to build into the formula some overhead costs for the County because I think eventually we want...if we are going to be involved, it needs to be sustainable. So how do we get there? And I realize this is a pilot project, but I think that is the direction we should move in. So I am not sure if this is the time or six months from now once your pilot is over, but if you could come up with what percentage, what makes sense because you will be devoting some time to making sure that these are up and running, and if it is down, you are going to be coordinating with our contractor and so forth.

The other question I had is that I want to thank you for also doing the example scenarios, and it is hard with only 20 cars on the island. It does not sound like there is going to be a lot of initial usage, but if we were to just take the first scenario where 10 hours, 5 chargers, \$82 a week, so if we were to say for six months that would come up to a little over \$2,000. So is the intention then that that would come out of the County energy budget?

Mr. Sato: We do not have any dedicated funds for this waiver. I do not believe the Mayor's Office also...this is pretty much what was developed after the budget period.

Ms. Nakamura: And then the next phase over would be...could be \$2,000, could be \$5,000, if you just multiply it by six months? So if it is \$205 a week, we are looking at 26 weeks? So that is how I got to the \$5,000 to figure out.

Mr. Sullivan: Okay, yes.

Ms. Nakamura: We will just pretty much, you were thinking absorb it into our energy line item.

Mr. Sato: We are going to track this thing carefully. If you have 20 cars, I guess I can equate it to if you offer free gas. Somebody can come and fill up their entire gas tank in 2 minutes and drive away. Chargers are going to...they are going to have to sit there for 4, 6 hours to get up to a full charge. If they want to do that, we will be able to tell if there are electric car drivers that are willing to go to that extreme. We are going to learn a lot through this pilot and the ability for us...we are coming to Council to institute a fee or to waiver such fee so we can activate these public chargers. Without your consent the chargers will just sit there and we cannot activate that.

Ms. Nakamura: Thank you very much.

Chair Chang: Any...Vice Chair.

Ms. Yukimura: Yes, so right now in the bill you have collection of user fees, all funds collected shall be deposited in the General Fund, even for experimental purposes? Maybe it might be good to have a special fund?



Mr. Sato: I had that discussion with the Finance Director, and we went back and forth on how much we thought would be generated, and if it is a low amount, to create a special fund and to do that that way was deemed too much administrative work.

Ms. Yukimura: I see, okay.

Mr. Sato: So the intent is the same thing, to track it, and if we are talking about just a few users for this trial period, this pilot program period, to just stick it back into the General Fund. But of course, we would be able to report what was provided...what was used at the public chargers, the reimbursement that we got from AV, and all that information.

Ms. Yukimura: So I can see that the decision about General or Special Fund can be made later on based on the data you get.

And this thing about 20 or 24 cars, when we register our cars, we all have to put down the model or the make. Why would not our Motor Vehicle Department be able to...

Mr. Sullivan: It is just a function of whether that term is searchable. So they have the information, they just cannot necessarily search it based on how their system is set up is, I think, what we understood.

Mr. Sato: Yes, I asked that specific question, can you track it if I say how many Nissan Leafs were registered, and the answer was not with the present system.

Ms. Yukimura: Even EVs, whether it is a Leaf, whatever the electric vehicle?

Mr. Sato: I was told that the only thing that they track are cars that request a special electric car license, and then they know. And at the end of 2011 there were 20 registered owners of electric vehicles.

Ms. Yukimura: I am thinking...

Chair Chang: Excuse me, Vice Chair, one fast second. We have, just to let the Members know, two more agenda items for the day in our Committees, so I would like to...I think we kind of came to the conclusion that we are going to gather a lot of information within the next six months on the pilot program, so if we can stick to the questions that we can get Ben and Glenn to answer, see if there is anybody in the public that has any questions, because I just want to be cautious of the other Committees based on the fact that we are about ready to...for the benefit of us that did not pack, I would like to try to get this thing going. Thank you.

Ms. Yukimura: Okay, got it, thank you.

Chair Chang: So let us stick to some questions that they can...thank you.

Ms. Yukimura: But I want to ask you folks to ask. I think there are many benefits to tracking type of vehicle. When we want to gather data on energy usage and on how we are going to...maybe new forms of registration fees and so forth, I think this...and I do not think it should be that hard to create some

category that gives us that information. So this may just be a good trigger to have them program that so you can get your information, but I am thinking we are going to need that kind of information into the future.

Mr. Sato: It might be a question for IT.

Ms. Yukimura: It will be.

Mr. Sato: So we will ask them.

Ms. Yukimura: Yes, okay, thank you.

Chair Chang: Thank you, Council Vice Chair. Hold on for a second, Mr. Chair, Councilmember Kualii was next. Go ahead.

Mr. Kualii: Thank you, just some quick questions. So when you said 20 to 24 electric vehicles, that is public or does that include the County?

Mr. Sato: I believe the 24 came from a DBEDT count, but I also believe that the DBEDT count we reported, we purchased our five Nissan Leafs via DBEDT, the ARRA funding came through the State Department of Business, Economic Development, and Tourism. So my thought is the 24 includes the County cars. So if you are looking at how many private electric cars are on Kaua'i, I would say 19 or 20 because Motor Vehicles said at the end of 2011 there were 20 cars that took out those special electric car license plates.

Mr. Kualii: The County only owns five?

Mr. Sato: Yes.

Mr. Kualii: And is there any in the pipe right now where we would have more anytime soon?

Mr. Sato: I think everybody is waiting for the trial period. We are testing the cars. We have drivers...Real Property, Parks & Recreation, Water Department, Economic Development, and Building Division are using those Nissan Leafs right now.

Mr. Kualii: You know when you were going over where the 10 stations were I could only follow eight. There are five at the Museum. Is that five County?

Mr. Sato: No.

Mr. Kualii: Some of it is public and some...

Mr. Sato: Five at the Kaua'i Museum corner, three are County chargers, two are public. There is one at the Pi'ikoi Building, that is a public charger. There are two at the Historic County Building; those two are public chargers. There is one at the Water Department and one at the Auto Shop. Those are County.

Mr. Kualii: So the two are Water and Auto that is not on Exhibits A and B.

Mr. Sato: Right, because those are County chargers.

Mr. Kualii: Then the last thing is on this ordinance it says the details of the guidelines for how the public will use these charging stations is not detailed yet. That is up to the Office of Economic Development, the County Engineer, or their designee. Because I am thinking what is it? First come, first served. How many hours can you put your car on it? Those kinds of things, that is...I mean it is going to be made available relatively soon, but only then will we know what the rules are and who can use it when?

Mr. Sato: Are you referring to like...

Mr. Kualii: The public.

Mr. Sato: The time they get to charge?

Mr. Kualii: I mean is it available 24 hours a day?

Mr. Sato: It is available...

Mr. Kualii: Is one vehicle limited to four hours or six hours so that other people have a chance?

Mr. Sato: The way the fee is structured, it is not just like one hour and you have to leave. It is basically how much time that you need to charge your car. So a car could be parked there for five hours. The ordinance says that the cars have to be actively charging and that is where we would like some leeway. The ordinance provides some enforcement.

Mr. Kualii: So if it fully charges in five hours and somebody left it overnight, and somebody stopped by and saw that it was not actively taking more charge, they should have moved the car.

Mr. Sato: Yes, they should have. We would probably try to get in touch with the owner and ask them or inform them that they should move their car as soon as the car completes charging. And if they are adamant about not complying, then at least we have something to fall back on in terms of some type of enforcement.

Mr. Kualii: You said the thing about being willing to leave it there for six hours, the time that it takes. So thinking about that, you think this huge County complex here with all our County employees, people are working here, so they park here. At the City of West Hollywood when I worked there they had a parking incentive because you had to pay for parking. So they gave a parking incentive for people who would ride the bus. So there was a value to it and maybe...I do not know if you have thought about it for County employees somehow working that in. Obviously you are going to do it for the County vehicles themselves and ultimately if you have a lot of vehicles and not enough stations, you will just schedule it in and make sure it is being plugged in, maximizing the use of each station. But I think as you think of it for County vehicles themselves, you should think of it for County employee vehicles and incentivizing that somehow with the parking. Thanks.

Chair Chang: Thank you. Further questions, Members? Any non-members? Council Chair, and then followed by Councilmember Rapozo.

Council Chair Furfaro: Gentlemen, this is not directed at this project, but it is a concern of ours on the Council. If we are going to do this right about tracking, there should have been a money bill that said we are anticipating expenses of \$3500. It is a small amount. But the point is when we are tracking, we have some real data that tells us hey, we set aside this money to particularly credit this program. Obviously we want to get some information from the meters that tells us what is the occupancy level going to be. Will the meters be able to tell us that?

Mr. Sullivan: Yes.

Council Chair Furfaro: Of that occupancy, do we know how much of that will be operating expenses versus revenue?

Mr. Sullivan: No.

Council Chair Furfaro: So that is the only caution I am saying about a new program. We really want to collect data that we understand. We just do not want the revenue put in the General Fund going forward. It is not just this program, it is any pilot we start we end up trying to reconstruct good data. I am delighted what you folks are doing. I just want you to know that we will be looking for crisp, clean data in six months, and it would have been nice to have an account set up where we could put that revenue. Thank you, Mr. Chang.

Chair Chang: Thank you very much, Chairman. Councilmember Rapozo.

Mr. Rapozo: Thank you. So the intent is to provide these chargers for vehicles that are going to be actively charging their vehicles, not just a parking stall for electric vehicles.

Mr. Sato: No. This particular ordinance is for cars that are in active charging mode.

Mr. Rapozo: Right, which means if it is not charging, then they get a ticket. I mean that is what it means.

Mr. Sato: Yes.

Mr. Rapozo: Or the police can actually move the car, tow the car because charging stations are intended for charging and not parking spaces.

Mr. Sato: Yes, yes.

Mr. Rapozo: And I am not on this Committee, so obviously I cannot do any amendments, but I would like to see a limit on the amount of time a car can sit in that stall, and I do not know if you can program the charger to limit it to four hours like Honolulu. In Honolulu it is four hours maximum. It will not charge beyond four. It will shut off and then you best move your car or it is going to get towed. Because otherwise you defeat the purpose of offering the chargers for other vehicles that may need the charging. I do not see that in here and I think that needs to be put in here. I think where I see it is on page 2 on item (3), "Such vehicle is not an electric vehicle at an electric vehicle charging station and actively using the charger for charging," if there is somewhere we can put in there provided that no one person can use the charger for more than four hours.

Mr. Sato: We are going back and forth with other counties too. The only county right now that I know of that has active chargers is the Big Island. The chargers you were mentioning sitting in Honolulu, are they State chargers?

Mr. Rapozo: That is State.

Mr. Sato: We are going back and forth; we are sharing information; we are learning. I cannot see this ordinance staying as is for a long, long time. It has to be revised just because the entire movement is moving so rapidly that we have to accommodate changes in technology where the cars maybe are able to charge faster, so they do not need to sit in the stalls for five or six hours. So that might be a consideration down the line.

Mr. Sullivan: And Councilman, I would add that during this first six-month period and actually immediately, we have the ability now to look at these time increments and to tell how many cars were there for how long, and how much energy they used. It is just not integrated into the billing yet. So we can look at all these issues. If we see an emergence of vehicles that charge at a faster rate and we are actually losing revenue, then we can know that there is some urgency to addressing what Council Chair mentioned. Or if we get complaints about the time, then you are absolutely right, it is an excellent point. We just do not know what the usage is going to be right now, so we have not developed those. Should it be three hours, should it be four hours, should it be six? But it is definitely a point that we will take note of and make sure we are following up on.

Council Chair Furfaro: It is great data that you are going to get an occupancy report and that will provide us with what kind of variances we should have in any amendments to the bill, but it will give us the occupancy, time and attendance.

Chair Chang: Any other questions, Members? If not, gentlemen, thank you very much for your presentation. Are there any members in the community who would like to speak on this agenda item. If not, we will call the meeting back to order.

There being no objections, the meeting was called back to order, and proceeded as follows:

Chair Chang: Further discussion, Members? Councilmember Bynum.

Mr. Bynum: I think this is a good way to go. I appreciate all the work that Glenn and Ben did on this. I think Councilmembers asked really good questions today, but the key word for me is pilot, and when they get more data we may need to do future revisions of this ordinance. And I would encourage them, as I said earlier, to reach out to private industry and see if we can get a working group on Kaua'i that says, hey, how is this going to work where there is consistency and the public understands how it works. But overall I would say, good job, guys, thank you.

Chair Chang: Thank you, Councilmember Bynum. Council Vice Chair Yukimura.

Ms. Yukimura: Yes, I am looking at page 2 of the bill and Section 16-10.6(c)(3), which is the underlined portion. I think what we are wanting to say here, correct me if I am wrong, it says, "Members of the police department and other persons authorized by the chief of police are authorized to remove or cause to be removed any vehicle parked within the areas described in subsection (d) herein when," and I think we want to say under (3), "Such vehicle is an electric vehicle at an electric vehicle charging station and not actively using the charger for charging." It has to be an electric vehicle, but it is not actively charging, right? So I think an amendment may be in order, and I can either have staff do one now and may...

Chair Chang: Vice Chair, hold on for one fast second. What I want to ask the Members, what I would like to do is...we have a motion to approve and a second. I would like to get this out because I do believe that we all need time because Councilmember Rapozo did express to me, as a non-member, he would like to propose an amendment. So what I would really like to do is if we can get...

Ms. Yukimura: Just pass it out and amend it on the Council floor?

Chair Chang: That is what I want to ask of the Members, if that is all right with everybody. We do have a motion to approve, we have a second, we do have two more agenda items before we have to...that is what I would be asking.

Ms. Yukimura: May I suggest an alternative, which is to go on to the next two items while we work on some amendments and just bring it back.

Council Chair Furfaro: I am fine with that, but it is your call, Dickie.

Chair Chang: That is fine, that is fine because we have people in the public that has been waiting to speak all day on other agenda items, and I do not want to inconvenience anybody in here. So that is fine with me if you want to work with the staff on any amendment, we can do that. But I would like to...as I mentioned, we do have a motion, we have a second to approve, and I would like to call for the question.

Ms. Yukimura: I am in favor of that too and I am thinking we can still save time and do our work in committee if we go on and let us work on the amendments. If it gets to be too entangled, we can then pass the whole thing out, but I think we can get this done quickly.

Council Chair Furfaro: So the way you would do that is you would recess your committee while the Member wants to work on the amendment, and then we come back to it if the amendment is introduced at the end.

Chair Chang: Okay, so...Councilmember Rapozo.

Mr. Rapozo: Again, I am a non-member and I am not prepared to do any amendments today. I cannot even introduce them, so I would have to go solicit the help from another member, but I am not ready to do an amendment right now because I have some issues with the pilot program. I agree with Mr. Imparato that in fact I think it is unfair to have the taxpayers subsidize the pilot program, I really do. I also have a problem with the \$1.81. It takes into no account administrative costs. One of the problems this County has whether it is driver licensing or whatever, we do not account for our employees' time. We charge \$5 or \$8 to do a license registration change, name change, address change, when we know it costs more than that. We are already \$75,000 back in this project because it cost

more than the grant was for. To go with the exact \$1.81 per hour, and let me just go real quickly, on O'ahu throughout the various places, they charge \$10 an hour or \$35 a day. Some of these places charge a session cost, so once you plug in it is \$4 a session plus \$2 for every half-hour. The lowest I found was \$2 an hour. That was the lowest I found on O'ahu with a limit of four hours of charging. There was one place that charges \$30 a day. It is a hotel. You have to pay to park there and the charging is included. I mean \$1.81, that is going to be very difficult. You are talking about reconciling an account, \$1.81? To me, my proposal would be \$2 an hour with a limit of four hours per charging. Again, I am a non-Committee member. I had hoped, I had thought that this was going to be deferred because it is the first Committee meeting. We just only had the public hearing last week. But if you folks are going to move forward, then I will submit my amendments at the full Council, which I know is...but I am not on the Committee here and I am not prepared. Thank you.

Chair Chang: Thank you very much, Councilmember Rapozo.

Council Chair Furfaro: Just a reminder here. Committee members should do their work in Committee, Dickie. For non-members, I may have something to introduce when it goes to the full Council, but I want to make sure it is the practice that the work is done at the Committee level.

Chair Chang: I understand. Council Vice Chair Yukimura.

Ms. Yukimura: Given Councilmember Rapozo's points, I think it might be appropriate to defer. So then if we defer it in Committee, I will be able to work on my amendment and Councilmember Rapozo will be able to work on some amendments that one of us might introduce.

Chair Chang: That is perfectly fine with the Members and the non-members. If somebody would like to make a motion to defer? If there is no further discussion, if you would like to make a motion.

Upon motion duly made by Councilmember Yukimura, seconded by Councilmember Kualii, and unanimously carried, Bill No. 2436 was deferred.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 1:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

*Wilma Akiona*

Wilma Akiona  
Council Services Assistant

APPROVED at the Committee Meeting held on July 5, 2012:



DICKIE CHANG  
Chair, Economic Development & Renewable Energy Strategies Committee